

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 12 2007

Appln. Serial No. 09/885,448  
Reply to non-final Office Action mailed on December 12, 2006**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the above amendment, claims 1, 3-5, 18, 20, 31, 33-36 and 38 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 18, 31 and 36 being the independent claims. Claims 2, 19, 32 and 37 are sought to be canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 18, 31 and 36 are sought to be amended. Entry and consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this amendment.

Applicant has made the above amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 18, 31 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, and citing the language "determining that the behavioral model is too specific". Applicant has deleted this language from the claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections to the claims.

Appln. Serial No. 09/885,448  
Reply to non-final Office Action mailed on December 12, 2006

*Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)*

Claims 1-5, 18-20, 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,965,743 to Malin et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Malin") in view of "Debugging Heterogeneous Distributed Systems Using Event-Based Models of Behavior" (hereinafter referred to as "Bates"). Claims 2, 19, 32 and 37 have been canceled rendering the rejection to these claims moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with regard to the pending claims since Malin and Bates, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of independent claims 1, 18, 31 and 36 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 18, 31 and 36 have been amended to include the similar feature of wherein creating the behavioral template comprises creating a visual prototype from an execution trace. Malin and Bates, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 1, 18, 31 and 36 (and their respective dependent claims) are patentable over Malin and Bates, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-0931 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 12 2007

Appln. Serial No. 09/885,448  
Reply to non-final Office Action mailed on December 12, 2006CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: April 12, 2007

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126

Molly A. McCall

Intel Corporation

c/o Intellevate, LLC

P.O. Box 52050

Minneapolis, MN 55402

PI8903 Reply to third non-final OA